

Louis Pasteur

J. R. CORMACK

Reprinted from the London "Month"

“LET us now praise famous men . . . leaders of the people by their counsels and by their knowledge of learning meet for the people, wise and eloquent in their instructions.”

Pasteur has every claim to be reckoned amongst the world's famous men; to none does the world owe more, for by his discoveries he lifted many a grievous burden from the bent shoulders of the race. The centenary of his birth and a recent biography gives us an opportunity of counting the gifts we owe him, and of rendering him anew the tribute of our thanks.

Pasteur was not an infant prodigy and only an average pupil at school; he took his *baccalauréat ès lettres* and *ès sciences* with the least possible distinction. But when launched on his career he showed himself a passionate worker as well as a genius. After making a sensational discovery in the science of crystallography, he was speedily promoted to the chair of chemistry at Strasbourg University. There he fell in love with Mlle. Marie Laurent, daughter of the rector of the university, and sought her hand; his letter to her father on the occasion is remarkable for its frank and manly tone:

My father is a tanner at Arbois, a little town in the Jura. My sisters help my father in his business and in the house, taking the place of the mother whom we had the misfortune to lose last May. My family is comfortably off but not rich. I estimate the value of all that we possess at not more than 50,000 francs (£2,000), and, as regards myself, I have long ago resolved to surrender to my sisters the whole share which would eventually be mine.

The lady was not at first impressed by her suitor, and Pasteur wrote to her: "All that I ask you, Mademoiselle, is not to judge me too quickly. You might be mistaken. Time will show you that under this cold and shy exterior there is a heart full of affection for you."

He won his bride, and she was to him the virtuous

woman whose price is far above rubies, one in whom the heart of her husband could safely trust. He was a loving husband and a good father. But he was also a devotee of science. When engaged in his laboratory, time did not exist for Pasteur, and mealtimes and appointments were quite forgotten. On one occasion the pair were going to some festivities together, and a friend tells us: "Pasteur returned to his laboratory 'for a few minutes,' as he stated, and then he forgot the passing hours; and Mme. Pasteur, who had waited for him in vain and missed the pleasure of attending the festivities, uttered not a word of reproach when her husband in the evening remarked simply: 'What would you have? I could not interrupt my experiments.'"

Of one so gifted with patience and sympathy we may well believe the words of a disciple of Pasteur who says: "She was not only an incomparable companion to her husband but also his best collaborator."

It is hard to summarize in a few words Pasteur's beneficent work. One discovery led to another, and he had no failures in his career; but we must bear in mind that few have ever worked with such passionate energy and determined perseverance to discover nature's secrets.

SPONTANEOUS GENERATION

From the study of fermentations he passed on to deal with the problem of spontaneous generation. The idea presented no difficulty to the pre-scientific world. Even the acute mind of St. Thomas accepted it without demur, and the belief being a necessity for materialists was prevalent till recent times. Virgil, we may remember, gives a recipe in the fourth Georgic for obtaining bees: a two-year-old bullock was to be slain and left to putrefy in a closed room with thyme and casia flowers strewn over it, and in a short time a swarm of bees would issue forth from the carcass. But the most amusing recipe is that given by Van Helmont—the Belgian chemist, 1577 (discoverer of sulphuric acid and first to use the word "gas")—for generating rats.

All that is required (he says) is to cork up a pot containing corn with a dirty shirt; after about twenty-one days a ferment coming from the dirty shirt combines with the effluvium from the wheat, the grains of which are turned into rats, not minute and puny, but vigorous and full of activity!

To some agnostics, as we have implied, the theory of spontaneous generation was welcome because it freed them from the necessity of believing in a Creator. One of these wrote at the time: "Spontaneous generation is no longer a mere hypothesis, it is a philosophic necessity. It alone is quite natural, and alone frees us for the future from childish cosmogonies, driving off the stage that external and quite artificial *deus ex machina* which centuries of ignorance have worshipped."

Pasteur had a great fight with these materialists before he won the battle. In a lecture at the Sorbonne in 1864 he said:

Public opinion . . . is always divided into two great lines of thought, as old as the world itself, called in our day, materialism and idealism. What a victory, gentlemen, what a victory for materialism if it could affirm that it was based on the proved fact that matter can of itself become organized, like life by itself, matter which has already in itself all the known forces! Ah, yes, if we could only add that other force called life, life varying in its manifestations with the conditions of our experiments, what more natural than to deify matter? What good, then, to go back to a primordial creation before the mysteries of which we can only kneel? What good the idea of God the Creator?

But Pasteur's conclusion, after much study, was: "There is always dust suspended in the air, and in the dust are always germs. These germs float in the air and carry life everywhere, for the germ is life. . . . Under no condition known to-day can we affirm that microscopic beings come into the world without germs, without parents of their own nature." And by his experiments he proved the truth of his words.

Pasteur's next achievement was to deal with the diseases of wine and beer. These he found were due to parasites which ceased to live when the liquid was brought to a certain temperature. The careful mother

who boils the children's milk is unconsciously applying Pasteur's discovery.

PASTEUR AND THE SILKWORM

In 1865, Pasteur was commissioned by the French Government to investigate the disease which was destroying the silkworms, and thus ruining the important silk industry of France. Pasteur undertook the task and his researches lasted six years. He paid a visit to Fabre, who was then at Avignon. Fabre knew Pasteur as the exploder of "the insanity of spontaneous generation." Pasteur, on his side, knew little of the subjects which engrossed Fabre's life and was wholly ignorant of the habits of silkworms. At his request Fabre undertook his instruction and brought in some cocoons. His further account of the interview is amusing:

He shook one against his ear. "It rattles," he said, quite surprised. "There is something inside."

"Why, yes!"

"But what?"

"The chrysalis."

"What's that—the chrysalis?"

"I mean the sort of mummy into which the caterpillar turns before it becomes a moth."

"And in every cocoon there is one of those things?"

"Of course; it's to protect the chrysalis that the caterpillar spins."

"Ah!"

Pasteur pocketed the cocoons for further study.

We might imagine that Pasteur was feigning ignorance, but Fabre's statement is corroborated by M. Duclaux, Pasteur's assistant. After years of work, Pasteur discovered one disease which was killing off the silkworm and thought that his task was at an end. But the little workers still died, so that further research was necessary, with the result that another disease of bacterial origin was discovered, and remedied. So the great chemist triumphed, solved his problem, and saved the silk industry for France.

Fabre, at the time of Pasteur's visit, enjoyed an in-

come of £64 a year! Pasteur, being then interested in the diseases of wine, asked Fabre to show him his wine-cellar; Fabre pointed to a jar in a corner of the room! Although Pasteur was astonished at Fabre's poverty, he went back to Paris, and, as far as we know, made no attempt to help the struggling naturalist, who, equally with himself, was giving his whole life to the cause of science.

True, Pasteur's career was one of unceasing and absorbing labor, but it was also one of triumphant successes; he was never handicapped, as Fabre was, by poverty or official opposition.

PASTEUR'S OTHER DISCOVERIES

As is well known, it was Pasteur's researches on germs and putrefaction that gave Lister of Edinburgh the clue which led to the antiseptic method of surgery; that is, the spraying and sterilizing by powerful disinfectants everything which comes in touch with the wound of the patient—not only the dressings and instruments, but the hands of surgeon and nurses and the atmosphere itself. "Abandon hope all ye who enter here," might have been inscribed over the entrance to any surgical hospital before Pasteur's discoveries. The antiseptic method turned the hospitals of the world from shambles into life-saving refuges.

Pasteur then studied the microbes which produced anthrax and chicken cholera, and devised means to counteract these scourges of animal life. His studies of microbes and germs led finally to the discovery for which he is most famous, the method of inoculation for rabies in animals and hydrophobia in man. He found that if he inoculated an animal with the virus of rabies it took the disease and died. But this virus could be attenuated by the action of oxygen. If an animal or man bitten by a mad dog were inoculated with a series of attenuated viruses rabies could be prevented—especially if the inoculation took place soon after the bite. The English Government sent a commission of experts to investigate Pasteur's claim to victory over this horrible disease, and after fourteen months they came to the conclusion that "it may be

taken as certain that M. Pasteur has discovered a method of preventing rabies comparable to that of vaccination for smallpox."

PASTEUR'S RELIGION

Pasteur was a firm Christian and a Catholic all his life, and he never failed to stand up like a man for the Faith which was in him. When we consider the sceptical tone of French official and professional life, and the persecution which the Church was constantly undergoing at the hands of various Governments, this open and unwavering profession of Catholicity becomes more remarkable. It has proved gall and wormwood to the militant atheist whose armory is grievously depleted by the existence of scientific men, eminent in science and steadfast in belief. Some members of the tribe must have started the rumor current some years back that Pasteur, after all, was only a Catholic in name. Happily there remain enough of his own writings and of the testimony of his contemporaries to show how groundless that rumor is. When he was elected a member of the Académie Française in 1881 he succeeded M. Littré, a Positivist. He chose the occasion of his inauguration to vindicate his Catholic belief and show the inadequacy of atheism. In the course of his address he pointed out that the Positivist conception of the world does not take into consideration the most important of all positive ideas, that of the infinite.

Beyond that starry vault what is there? New starry skies? So be it! And beyond them? The human mind, urged by an irresistible force will never cease asking: And what is there beyond that? Can there ever be an end to time or space? An end proves a limited greatness, simply greater than what has preceded it, and hardly has one begun to contemplate it, than the inevitable question returns, and the cry of curiosity can never be stifled. It is no use replying: beyond is space, time, a greatness illimitable. Nobody can understand such words. He who proclaims the existence of the infinite, and no one can escape this, accumulates in this statement more of the supernatural than is contained in all the miracles of all countries, for the idea of the infinite has the double character of being un-

avoidable and incomprehensible. When this idea takes possession of the mind there is nothing left but to prostrate oneself. . . .

. . . Believe me, in the face of these great problems, these eternal subjects of man's solitary meditation, there are only two attitudes of mind; one created by faith, the belief in the solution given by divine revelation, and one of torment to the soul in the pursuit of impossible explanations, expressing this torment by absolute silence, or by what comes to the same thing, by admitting the impossibility of understanding or knowing anything of these mysteries.

And later on, speaking of life after death, he exclaimed:

Beside the couch of a beloved one who has just been taken from you by death, do you not feel something within you which cries out that the soul is immortal?

We gather from his biographers that Pasteur was rough in manner but simple-minded and of tender heart. For instance, he was so warmly devoted to the memory of his parents that often on public occasions he could not mention their names without shedding tears. His religion was unostentatious, but firm and devoted; and that at a time when scepticism was fashionable, especially in scientific circles. He will always be remembered by the uncompromising declaration uttered a few years before his death at the College of Dole: "When one has studied much, he comes back to the faith of a Breton peasant: as to me, had I studied more I would have the faith of the Breton peasant's wife." For he knew that faith is in no way opposed to science, but only to the unscientific prejudices and pretensions of those who push science beyond its limits. And he knew faith—acceptance of truth on God's testimony—is of all mental acts the most reasonable.

On his seventieth birthday, December 27, 1892, an international committee assembled in Paris and presented him with the homage of the civilized world. Pasteur entered the great amphitheatre of the Sorbonne leaning on the arm of his son, and on that of the President of the Republic. All who were present rose to their feet and greeted him with cheers. M. d'Abbadie, President of the Academy, presented to him

a large gold medal struck in commemoration of the day, and engraved upon it was this inscription:

"To Pasteur on his 70th Birthday from Grateful Science and Humanity."

Then Sir Joseph Lister, one of the delegates of the English Royal Society, read an address, which rehearsed all the benefits to medicine and surgery which had resulted from Pasteur's researches, and offered him the homage of the medical world. The words read like a bull of scientific canonization, and some passages may be quoted here:

There is certainly not in the entire world a single person to whom medical science is more indebted than to you. Your researches on fermentation have thrown a flood of light which has illumined the gloomy shadows of surgery, and changed the treatment of wounds from a matter of doubtful and too often disastrous empiricism into a scientific art, certain and beneficent. . . . But medicine owes as much to your profound and philosophic studies as does surgery. You have raised the veil which had for centuries covered infectious diseases. You have discovered and proved their microbic nature and thanks to your initiative, and in many cases to your own special labor, there are already a host of these destructive disorders of which we now completely know the cause. . . . Your fine discoveries of the attenuation and reinforcement of virus and of preventive inoculations serve, and will serve, as a lodestar. As a brilliant illustration I may note your studies of rabies. Their originality was so striking that . . . everybody now recognizes the greatness of that which you have accomplished against this terrible malady. . . . If this were your only claim on humanity you would deserve its eternal gratitude. You can, therefore, understand that medicine and surgery are eager on this great occasion to offer you the profound homage of their admiration and of their gratitude.

Pasteur, with much emotion, spoke a few words, and then a speech was read for him by his son. He said: "The future will belong to those who have done most for suffering humanity." He urged young men to consider: "What have I done for my education? What have I done for my country?" so that on nearing the

grand goal each might be entitled to say: "I have done what I could." One present remarked: "It was a unique spectacle, in which a great man was, in Shakespeare's phrase, 'carried in triumph on the hearts of all.'"

When the end of his life approached, indeed, on the very day of his death, he piously received the Last Sacraments. He turned to his devoted disciples who were near him. "*Où en êtes-vous?*" he exclaimed. "*Que faites vous?*" And then he murmured his favorite words, "*Il faut travailler.*" His biographer tells us: "One of his hands lay in that of Madame Pasteur's; the other held a crucifix. In this room, which had something of the simplicity of a monk's cell, on Saturday, September 28, 1895, surrounded by his family and his disciples, he gently passed away."

Common Life Among the Early Catholics

REV. J. B. McLAUGHLIN, O.S.B.

The Liverpool "Catholic Times."

WHAT exactly was the common life of the first Christians? It is described for us in the Acts of the Apostles fully enough, if we will only read the whole description. But we cannot learn it by taking an isolated phrase and putting our own meaning into it.

To say "they had all things in common" does not tell us whether they lived such a common life as do nuns or monks who live in religious communities; or whether they lived the communistic life that some Socialists think possible and desirable; or whether it was some other kind of common life. Anyone who wants to argue from what they did must first know what they did.

A COMMUNITY IN THE COMMUNITY

They formed a community within the community. Anyone who joined them was to be supported by them; but not anyone outside their body. Those of them who had lands or houses sold them to someone in the outside world, and, receiving money for them, gave it to their own community for the support of all. "They that believed

were all together, and had all things common. Their possessions and goods they sold, and divided them to all, according as everyone had need. . . . Neither did anyone say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but all things were common to them. Neither was there anyone needy among them. Distribution was made to everyone according as he had need." (Acts ii, 44; iv, 32—35.)

This selling of property was purely voluntary; so was the surrendering of the price. Ananias and Saphira sold a piece of land, and by fraud kept back part of the price. St. Peter, in rebuking the lie, told them it was without excuse, since they could have kept the land or the price if they wished. "Whilst it remained, did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold, was it not still in thy power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart?" (v, 4.)

These moneys were surrendered to the Apostles, as fathers in the communitiy. Owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things they sold and laid it down before the feet of the Apostles. Barnabas, having land, sold it, and brought the price and laid it at the feet of the Apostles. But Ananias sold a piece of land and kept back part of the price; and bringing a certain part of it, laid it at the feet of the Apostles (iv, 34-v, 2). The givers of money did not thereby get any claim to govern the Church. They were not bound to give; but if they gave, their control ceased when they laid their money at the Apostles' feet. To understand what followed we must try to see what principle and motive led to this practise of surrendering all their wealth to the Apostles to be used for the whole community. It was because they recognized that all owners are "stewards of the manifold good things of God," and are meant to "do good to all men, but especially to those of the household of the Faith," as St. Paul afterwards expressed it. And at first, the obvious and best way of using their wealth for this, its appointed purpose, was to continue the practise which Our Lord had begun with the Apostles.

All that He or they received was put in one common purse, which Judas had in charge, and from which he bought all they needed and gave alms to the poor. Mary

Magdalene's ointment of great price Judas would have sold for 300 pence, to be put into his purse for the poor, "not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and, having the purse, carried the things that were put therein. . . . Some thought because Judas had the purse, that Jesus had said to him: Buy those things which we have need of for the festival day; or that he should give something to the poor" (John xii, 6; xiii, 29). This system the Apostles would naturally keep till after the Ascension; and for a time it sufficed. While the numbers of the flock were still comparatively small, and all "had but one mind and one soul" (Acts iv, 32), this family system was effective. Everything was given to the Apostles, and they as heads of the family deputed whom they would to minister to the needs of all. But presently came complaints that the system was not working. Everything was still being given to the Apostles to meet the needs of all; but the needs of all were not being met. The numbers were growing rapidly, and two distinct groups were now in the family—the Greek-speaking Jews and the Hebrew-speaking Jews. Since at first all the family had been Hebrews, all the ministration was at first in Hebrew hands; the need of giving the Greeks a share in it would not be thought of till after it was noticed that they were a distinct group.

GRIEVANCE OF THE GREEKS

And meantime, every Greek who felt neglected had a grievance against a Hebrew administrator. "The number of the disciples increasing, there arose a murmuring of the Greeks against the Hebrews, for that their widows were neglected in the daily ministration" (Acts vi, 1).

The Apostles went straight to the root of the difficulty. Not they, but their agents, were distrusted. If they could get agents whom all would trust, then the system would still work; men would lay their all at the feet of the Apostles, knowing that it would be used for the needs of all. So the Apostles instituted what has remained the typical method of filling offices in the Catholic Church. "Look ye out men . . . whom we may appoint." They told the flock to select their own candidates; and these they appointed. Selection from below, appointment

from above. Their selection by the people ensures that they have the people's confidence; their appointment by the Apostles ensures that they have authority. "Brethren, look ye out among you seven men of good reputation, full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. . . . These they set before the Apostles; and they praying imposed hands on them" (vi, 3—6).

So for a while longer the same family system worked. But shortly afterwards St. Stephen was martyred, and a great persecution scattered the family; "they were all dispersed through the countries of Judea and Samaria, except the Apostles; as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch" (viii, 1; xi, 19).

After this there is no sign of any attempt to continue the system of one common fund for the whole family. The Catholics everywhere still recognized that their goods are given by God for the needs of all their brethren; but they were now taught to meet these needs by almsgiving, and not by surrendering all their properties into one common fund. St. Paul with his traveling companions formed indeed one family, living a common life such as had been at Jerusalem; and doubtless there were many such groups, who handed on the practise to the early monks. But St. Paul had no notion of admitting all Catholics into his little community; they were not to lay their wealth at his feet. "I have not coveted any man's silver, gold, or apparel, as you yourselves know; for such things as were needful for me and them that are with me, these hands have furnished" (xx, 33). From all over the world alms were freely given for the needs of the Church in Jerusalem, for the clergy, for the poor.

The Apostles preached the fundamental reasons for this almsgiving. He that sees his brother in need and does not help him, how does the charity of God dwell in him? The Lord appointed that they who preach the Gospel are to live by the Gospel; let the hearer share with his teacher all good things. You have received from them spiritual riches, it is very little to make a return of temporal riches. But all this is to be the giving of a man who manages his own property and chooses his own charities. "Concerning the collections that are made for the saints; as I have

given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye also. On the first day of the week let every one of you put apart with himself, laying up what it shall well please him; everyone as he hath determined in his heart; not with sadness or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver" (I Cor., xvi, 1; II Cor., ix, 7).

LIVING AS ONE FAMILY

We see, therefore, that for a time the early Christians lived as one family, every member giving all his money to the head of the family, every member looking to the head of the family to supply all his needs. The Apostles were the head of the family. Their proper work was to minister spiritual food to the souls of their flock, not to feed their bodies. But the care of the body was put upon them because the people trusted them absolutely; trusted them to see that all the income was used impartially to supply the needs of all. The Apostles accepted the responsibility as long as they could get others to do the work faithfully. But they would not do it themselves. "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve the tables. We will give ourselves continually to prayer and the ministry of the word." (vi. 2-4).

For a time they did the work through agents who had no special status or responsibility; then for a further time through the seven deacons whom they ordained expressly for this work. When the faithful were scattered by persecution, the system of one family life became impossible.

Each resumed responsibility for his own wealth and his own support. Those who would might unite into small families living a common life among themselves. But the days of one large family and one common life for the whole Church was ended. In these changing methods there was no change of principle. "God has made all of these things to meet the wants of men. He has made you steward over some of them, to use them for your own wants and for all who have a claim on you." That is the unchanging principle. For a time they carried it out by pooling their property; afterwards by giving alms "everyone as he hath determined in his heart."

Catholics and Their Beliefs

The Nativity "Monitor"

The following correspondence between a prominent Atlanta non-Catholic and Rt. Rev. Benjamin J. Keiley, D.D., retired Bishop of Savannah, is self-explanatory.

I am writing to you because during your ten years' residence in Atlanta I was honored by your friendship, and I cherish with confidence the hope that that friendship still endures. Many changes have taken place in our city during those five and twenty years. I do not refer merely to the wonderful material growth of Atlanta. I regret to admit that other changes have taken place here, of which no good Atlantan can be proud.

In the olden days we boasted very much of the "Atlanta spirit," which meant that in everything which tends to promote the interests of Atlanta we had a people willing, united and determined. I have never seen in such matters a better illustration of team work. But today we are confronted by a wave of religious intolerance and bigotry. When you lived here you were a Catholic priest and I then, as now, a Protestant layman, and yet that did not interfere with our friendly relations.

It never entered into my mind then that you were not a good American because you were a Catholic. But today there is a number of secret, oath bound societies which proclaim no Catholic can be a loyal American, and seek to prevent them from holding office. I have met and talked with a number of my Protestant friends, who, have an undefined suspicion of Catholics and the Catholic Church. It seems to me that these suspicions are based on their idea of the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Bible and the public schools.

I am going to ask you to give me a plain and direct answer to the following questions:

1. Is it not true as a matter of fact that the Catholic Church discourages the reading of the Bible by Catholics?
2. Is it not true that the reason for this is her fear that the reading of the Scriptures by Catholics would cause

them to see the errors of their church and become Protestants?

3. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the rise and spread of Protestantism was due to the fortunate discovery of the Bible and its being placed in the hands of the people who had hitherto known nothing of it?

4. What is the exact reason why the Catholic Church discourages the reading of the Bible by the laity?

5. Why is the Catholic Church opposed to the public schools?

6. It is said that no Catholic can be a loyal American on account of his allegiance to the Pope. What truth if any is in this charge?

I am writing to you because I know there is a large number of Protestants who have heard these and similar charges and accept them as true. Knowing you as I do I believe you will give me a direct answer.

BISHOP KEILEY'S ANSWER

I know the changes to which you refer in your letter, and I regret them exceedingly. Such a course will materially injure the progress of any city. I thank you for your confidence and it is my hope that my answer, if it serves no other purpose, will convince you that your confidence has not been misplaced. I shall answer as briefly, as clearly and as frankly as I can, each of the questions you propose.

Your first question is: Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that the Catholic Church discourages the reading of the Bible by Catholics? Did I think that this reply was intended solely for you, I would content myself with a single denial of assertion, but I rather imagine that my reply will be shown to others. Hence my answer will be a brief statement of facts.

The Catholic Bishops of the United States at the conclusion of the Third Plenary Council held in Baltimore in 1884 addressed a pastoral letter to the Catholics of this country from which I quote: "The most highly valued treasure of every family library and the most frequently and lovingly made use of should be the Holy Scriptures." Doubtless in the fourth book of the 'Imitation' you

have often read à Kempis' burning thanksgiving to our Lord for having bestowed on us 'the priceless treasure of the Holy Scripture,' the Holy Books for the comfort and direction of our life." Does not this seem to encourage a practise which you claim the Catholic Church seeks to discourage?

Pope Pius VI, in a letter to the Archbishop of Florence declares "that the Faithful should be moved to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are most abundant sources, which ought to be left open for every one to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times."

Your second question assumes as a fact that the Church discourages the reading of the Bible and also that the alleged prohibition is caused by the fear that Catholics may become Protestants. Having shown that the charge in the first question is untrue, I might properly content myself with ignoring the second. But I wish to be perfectly frank and will make some few observations which will serve as an answer.

Of course, if the Catholic Church believed that the reading of the Scriptures would cause her children to become Protestants, she would assuredly not recommend it. But she does recommend it. Therefore she has no fear. Let us take a common sense and practical view of this question. Every Catholic is bound to believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the inspired word of God. Every Catholic knows that the official prayer-books of the Catholic Church are the Missal and the Breviary, which are composed of quotations from the Bible; that the Bible is read in the vernacular every Sunday in the solemn service of the Church, and that all stand in reverence while it is being read; that the Holy Scriptures form the most important part of the education of Catholic priests; that the Holy Scriptures most clearly demonstrate her claim to be the Church founded by Christ, and that we prove the truth of our doctrines by plain and evident texts of the Holy Scriptures.

Can any one assign a reason why the Church should object to her children reading the Bible, or fear the consequence of such reading?

In your third question you ask if the rise and spread of what is called Protestantism was not due to the fortunate discovery of the Bible and its being placed in the hands of the people who knew nothing of it. This statement assumes, of course, that the Reformers first gave the Bible to the people.

The *Church Times*, a Protestant publication of England in an issue of July, 1878, said:

This catalogue [the Claxton] will be very useful for one thing at any rate—as disproving the popular lie about Luther finding the Bible for the first time at Erfurt about 1507. Not only were there many editions of the Latin Vulgate long anterior to that time, but there were actually nine German editions of the Bible in this exhibition earlier than 1483, the year of Luther's birth, and at least three more before the end of the century.

Sir Thomas More, the chancellor of Henry VIII, said: "The whole Bible was, long before Wyckliffe's time, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people, with devotion and soberness, well and reverently read."

In the Greenville Library in the British Museum, there is a nearly complete set of fourteen grand old German Bibles, 1460-1518—the first published twenty odd years before the birth of Luther.

The *Athenæum*, in an article "The German Bible Before Luther" says: "The Bible was in common use among the people long before Luther's time! and he evidently had the old Catholic German Bible of 1483 before him while making his translations."

In a review of Dr. Edgar's "The Bible of England," the Protestant reviewer says:

Dr. Edgar still repeats the oft-exploded notion that the Catholic Church had a wide horror of Scripture translation, whether accompanied with notes or not, and however faultlessly executed. He does not seem to know that long before the Reformation every Catholic nation all over Europe had versions of the Bible in the vernacular of the country.

Let me state a few facts with regard to editions of the Bible. Between 1477, when the first edition of the first French New Testament was published at Lyons, and 1535, when the first French Protestant editions was published,

upward of twenty editions of the Bible in the French vernacular issued from the Catholic press. In Germany, prior to the first publication of the first edition of Luther's Bible, 1534, no fewer than thirty Catholic editions of the entire Scriptures and parts of the Bible appeared in the German vernacular. In Italy, the very seat of the Papacy, two editions of an Italian translation appeared in 1471, and several other editions appeared prior to the Reformation. The first German printed Bible issued from the Mintz Press about 1462. Another version came out in 1466. There were twenty-seven different editions of the Bible in German printed before that of Luther, independent of the two at Leipsic.

In Spain, in 1405, the whole Bible was published in the vernacular, and again in 1478 and 1515, with the approbation of the Church. In 1512, the New Testament appeared, and it was reprinted in 1544, 1601, 1603, 1608 and 1615.

It may not be out of place to state here in passing that as our Protestant friends proclaim that their religion is based on the reading of the Holy Scriptures, it could not have come into existence before the invention of printing and paper, and these inventions, as is well known, were not discovered for far more than one thousand years after Christ. The conclusion it seems to me is very obvious.

The fourth question assuredly needs no reply, for as we have seen the Catholic Church does not discourage but rather encourages the reading of the Holy Scriptures.

Your fifth question asks the reason of the opposition of the Catholic Church to the public schools.

In the first place it seems hardly necessary to state that the Catholic Church cannot be held responsible for everything said by Catholics. The same rule naturally applied to all of the Protestant sects. It would be manifestly very unfair to hold the Baptist or Methodist sects responsible for everything said even by some of their preachers.

The attitude of the Catholic Church toward the public schools can be well understood if we regard her teaching. She holds man was created for no other purpose than to know, love and serve God here in order to obtain eternal life; that everything must be subordinate to this end, and hence she insists that a knowledge of God, his claims and

the duty of men to God are the most important things to be known.

In accordance with this view, while favoring the highest and best secular education, she insists strongly that a moral and religious education must accompany it. Now, as every one well knows, such moral and religious education may not be given in the public schools. The plea that the Sunday School and the Church will supply such an education is a vain statement. It presupposes what we most vehemently deny, that the purely secular education is the matter of the greatest importance, for it gives five-sixths of the year to the secular and one-sixth to the religious education. We believe that it is of far greater importance to know of the redemption of man by Christ's Blood than to know the story of the war between the States. No one dare teach the former in the public schools, while the latter, I presume, is taught there. We have nothing whatever to say against the efficiency of the public school curriculum; but we deplore most sincerely its insufficiency in matters of paramount importance. That, in a nut-shell, is the Catholic view in the matter of the public school.

And now I come to the consideration of your last question, in which you ask if it is not true that Catholics cannot be loyal Americans on account of their allegiance to the Pope. This question assumes that Catholics are not loyal Americans. Such a charge is baseless and absolutely false. Can you give any proof of this charge? What is loyalty, after all? It is certainly not a mere lip service, but a true devotion to one's country, and obedience to its laws, and a willingness to give life itself to its service. Can you cite any instance where Catholics have been derelict in this duty?

During the late Great War there were more Catholics in proportion to their numbers in the service of the United States than members of any other religious body. The Supreme Commander, whose genius and skill won victory for the just cause of the allies was a devout Catholic, and a loyal spiritual subject of the Pope. No one but a bigot or a fool would dare question the loyalty of Marshal Foch to France.

The late Chief Justice of the United States was a devout

Catholic. Did any one ever question his loyalty? The man who had charge of the foreign operations of the American navy in the Great War was a Catholic. Who questions his loyalty?

I confess that I find it very difficult to discuss this question with patience, the charge is so monstrous and so false. Let me say in passing that no one can be a loyal American who is not a firm supporter of law and order, and there is not a State in the Union where there is more disregard of law and order than Georgia. And Georgia has but a handful of Catholics. I commend this fact to some of your Atlanta politicians.

Of course, I understand quite well that you have no belief in this monstrous charge, so let me briefly state our position. We believe that the Scriptures are the inspired Word of God, and the Scriptures clearly and explicitly declare that Christ gave to Simon Peter and his successors supreme authority in teaching and governing the whole flock of Christ. Now, this teaching authority embraces, or has for its object, Divine Revelation. This Divine Revelation includes faith and morals. With regard to morals, the Catholic Church, of which the Pope is the supreme spiritual head and divinely guided teacher, tells all of her children that they must render to God what belongs to God and to Caesar what belongs to Caesar. Now, what "belongs to Caesar" means our duty to the Government under which we live; hence our spiritual allegiance to the Pope of necessity makes us loyal to the Government. In other words, the good Catholic is, in conscience, bound to obey the laws and respect the authority of the country. He must be loyal to it, must support it and, if need be, give his life for it. And in doing all these things he gives the best proof to his fellows of his allegiance to the supreme spiritual authority of the Pope.

I am very glad to notice that the papers of Atlanta have become aware that this exhibition of ignorance, intolerance and bigotry is hurting the city. I had cherished the hope that they would recognize the falsity of the charges made against us, and their gross injustice to us. But perhaps it is as well not to insist too much on this point, but to thank God that something has moved them to take a stand for the right.